UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

David Johnson

v.

Civil No. 12-cv-032-SM

Town of Weare, et al.

O R D E R

On November 5, 2012, a preliminary pretrial conference was held in this case. Plaintiff appeared on his own behalf; Attorney Charles P. Bauer appeared for defendants

Town of Weare and Weare Police Department; and Attorney

Andrew B. Livernois appeared for defendant Officer Frank

Jones.

The key deadlines in the discovery plan are summarized in the chart below. The parties concurred with respect to each of the following deadlines.

| Scheduling Designation | Deadline |
|------------------------|---|
| Track Assignment | Standard - 12 mos. |
| Mandatory Disclosures | The parties have agreed to make Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures. |
| Interrogatories | A maximum of 25 interrogatories by each party to any other party. |
| Requests for Admission | A maximum of 15 requests by each party to any other party. |

| Depositions | A maximum number of 10 depositions by plaintiff and 10 by defendants. |
|--|---|
| Demand | January 15, 2013 |
| Claims by Unnamed Parties | February 10, 2013 |
| Joinder of Additional Parties | February 10, 2013 |
| Third-Party Actions | February 10, 2013 |
| Amendment of Pleadings | February 10, 2013 |
| Offer | February 15, 2013 |
| Motions to Dismiss | March 1, 2013 |
| Experts and Experts' Written Reports | Plaintiff: April 1, 2013 Defendants: June 1, 2013 |
| Supplementation under Rule 26(a) | July 15, 2013 |
| Motions for Summary Judgment | August 1, 2013 |
| Joint Statement re Mediation | August 1, 2013 |
| Challenges to Expert Testimony | September 1, 2013 |
| Completion of Discovery | October 1, 2013 |
| Type of Trial | Jury |
| Trial Estimate (number of days) | 2-3 days |
| Trial Date | Two-week period beginning December 10, 2013 |

The court construes "Plaintiff's Amended Complaint"

(doc. no. 18) as an addendum to plaintiff's complaint.

Although an answer is not required, defendants may supplement their answers if they deem it necessary. The clerk's office is directed to adjust the docket accordingly.

In light of the court's approval of defendant's proposed discovery plan (doc. no. 14), the court denies as moot plaintiff's proposed discovery plan (doc. no. 17).

Landya B McCafferty

United States Magistrate Judge

November 5, 2012

cc: David Johnson, pro se
 Charles P. Bauer, Esq.
Andrew B. Livernois, Esq.